

## **REMARKS**

Claim 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 11 and 12 have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 1-12 will be pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, and 10, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e) as being anticipated by Simpson et al. (US 2005/0128988). These rejections are traversed.

In order that the rejections be sustainable, it is fundamental that “each and every element as set forth in the claim be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also, Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989), where the court states, “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”.

Furthermore, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

The Examiner has opinioned that Simpson teaches determining processing tasks that need only to be operated for a brief period of time during the reception of a received packet and enabling said processing tasks only during said brief period of time of said received packet. This interpretation is traversed.

The scanning tasks and time interval period of Simpson is not the packet processing tasks and the packet duration of the Application’s embodiments. The section cited by Examiner deals with beacon signals, gratuitous probe responses

and their time interval. The system in Simpson is not processing a packet at the time interval described.

The claims have been amended to specifically describe the processing tasks to be "packet" processing tasks.

Furthermore, with regard to Simpson et al., submit herewith is a copy of a Declaration and Appendix A being sent to the last know address of inventor Jie Liang under 37 C.F.R. 1.131. The conception of the embodiments of the invention took place before the effective date of Simpson et al. Additional Applicant and Assignee were diligent in filing the application.

Claims 3, 5, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of Brown et al. (US 6,366,622). As shown above, even if Simpson is available as proper art, Simpson alone or in combination with Brown fail to teach the limitations of the claims.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted:

/Steven A. Shaw/

---

Steven A. Shaw  
Reg. No.: 39,368

---

Date

Customer No.: 23494  
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED  
P.O. Box 655474, M.S. 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
Telephone: (972) 917-5137  
Facsimile: (972) 917-4418  
email: [steven-shaw@ti.com](mailto:steven-shaw@ti.com)